

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/757,841	METZGER, THOMAS	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Barbara Summons	2817	

**All Participants:**

(1) Barbara Summons.

(2) Mr. Mark Bergner (Reg. No. 45,877).

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 18 August 2005

**Time:** 3:00 pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*None*

**Claims discussed:**

*1, 6, and 7*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability in Part II above  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*Barbara Summons*

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed that the section 112 antecedent basis problem that had been corrected in claim 1, had not been corrected in claims 6 and 7 as rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1. It was agreed that the Examiner would add by Examiner's amendment the phrase "said at least one layer with high acoustic impedance being formed as a structured layer" to claims 6 and 7, in the same place it was added in claim 1, to provide antecedent basis for the subsequently recited "said structured layer". Also discussed that claims 6 and 7 do not require the claim 4 feature "said piezoelectric layer comprising a multi-layer assembly" that appears on lines 6-7 in each of the claims. This appeared to be a typographical error wherein claim 1 was copied into claims 6 and 7 after it was amended to include the limitation of claim 4, rather than before it was amended. Therefore, it was agreed that the Examiner would delete this feature from claims 6 and 7 by Examiner's amendment..